From: Jay Field
To: Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
Cc: Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; Bob Dexter; Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; John Malek; Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; PETERSON.Jennifer@deq.state.or.us; Robert W. Gensemer; Robert.Neely@noaa.gov
Subject: Re: Number of growth-based low level hits in the round 2 report
Date: 06/06/2008 04:22 PM

Eric,
the statistics on mortality were included separately in the table. 10
samples for Hyalella and 13 for Chironomus were classified as Level 1
(statistical significant difference from control and between 80 and 90%
control-adjusted survival.
Jay

Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov wrote:
> Does anyone have statistics on mortality since these were lumped in as
> well?
>
> Eric
>
>
>
> Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US
> 06/06/2008 03:36 PM
> To
> "Robert W. Gensemer" <rgensemer@parametrix.com>
> cc
> Bob Dexter <bob@ridolfi.com>, Chip Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Jay Field <Jay.Field@noaa.gov>, John Malek <JMalek@parametrix.com>, Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, "PETERSON.Jennifer@deq.state.or.us" <PETERSON.Jennifer@deq.state.or.us>, "Robert.Neely@noaa.gov" <Robert.Neely@noaa.gov>
> Subject
> RE: Number of growth-based low level hits in the round 2 report (Document link: Eric Blischke)
>
>
>
> Good work, Jay!
>
> I told Joe I'd by either him or you the beverage of your choice
> depending on who dug this out first, looks like you win. Maybe I need
> to by all of us that drink after discussing this.
>
> Best regards,
>
> Burt Shephard
> Risk Evaluation Unit
> Office of Environmental Assessment (OEA-095)
> U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 10
> 1200 6th Avenue
> Seattle, WA 98101
>
> Telephone: (206) 553-6359
> Fax: (206) 553-0119
>
> e-mail: Shephard.Burt@epa.gov
>
> "Facts are stubborn things"
>   - John Adams
>
>
>
> "Robert W. Gensemer" <rgensemer@parametrix.com>
> 06/06/2008 03:09 PM
> To
> Jay Field <Jay.Field@noaa.gov>
> cc
> Joe Goulet/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, Burt Shephard/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, "Robert.Neely@noaa.gov" <Robert.Neely@noaa.gov>, Eric Blischke/R10/USEPA/US@EPA, "PETERSON.Jennifer@deq.state.or.us" <PETERSON.Jennifer@deq.state.or.us>, John Malek <JMalek@parametrix.com>, Bob

> Dexter <bob@ridolfi.com>, Chip
> Humphrey/R10/USEPA/US@EPA
> Subject
> RE: Number of growth-based low
> level hits in the round 2 report
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
>
> That’s great, Jay, thanks. The "level 1" data in your attached table are
> exactly the data we were discussing on tuesday, and do indeed support
> the existance of this lower level threshold group (the 80-90% effects
> group), even for growth endpoints. So it would appear to me that LWG
> lumped the Level 1 and 2 results into their single "level 2" category in
> the round 2 report (as in Table 3-30 of appendix G).
> -Bob
>
> From: Jay Field [mailto:Jay.Field@noaa.gov]
> Sent: Friday, June 06, 2008 3:05 PM
> To: Robert W. Gensemer
> Cc: Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov; Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov;
> Robert.Neely@noaa.gov; Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov;
> PETERSON.Jennifer@deq.state.or.us; John Malek; Bob Dexter;
> Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov
> Subject: Re: Number of growth-based low level hits in the round 2 report
>
> Attached is a summary of the round 2 tox results. According to my
> analysis, 43 and 1l samples were significantly different from control
> and between 80 and 90% of control (Level 1) for Hyalella and Chironomus
> growth respectively. There were a few samples within the Level 1 range
> of difference from control that were not significantly different but
> most were significantly different. This indicates that the test can
> clearly discriminate differences at that level. Level 1 toxicity
> provides useful, valid risk asssessment information and is important for
> evaluating spatial gradients. Whether it is critical for decision-making
> after the risk asssessment is a risk management decision.
> Jay
>
> Note: I am fairly certain that these results are consistent with LWG
> summaries but did not do a detailed check with Lorraine Read's
> spreadsheets. I would be glad to discuss this further when I am back
> from leave on Monday.
>
> Robert W. Gensemer wrote:
> P.S. Upon reading LWG's methods text more carefully, the analysis below
> may not be correct. As in the text screenshot appended below (page 21 of
> Appendix G), I think their "minor (L2)" effects have to EXCEED 80% and
> be significantly different from controls, so this would not be the
> 10-20% effects range we are seeking. Jay did mention he was sure
> significant effects on growth were observed for one or both species in
> the 10-20% effects range, so perhaps he can help guide us as to how to
> track these data down?
> -Bob
>
>
>
> From: Robert W. Gensemer
> Sent: Wednesday, June 04, 2008 9:54 AM
> To: 'Jay Field'; Goulet.Joe@epamail.epa.gov
> Cc: Shephard.Burt@epamail.epa.gov; Robert.Neely@noaa.gov;
> Blischke.Eric@epamail.epa.gov; PETERSON.Jennifer@deq.state.or.us; John
> Malek; Bob Dexter; Humphrey.Chip@epamail.epa.gov
> Subject: Number of growth-based low level hits in the round 2 report
> Importance: High
>
> Folks: In response to the discussion on TCT this morning, I looked at
> the round 2 report for evidence of significant growth effects (both
> species) in the 10-20% effect range. LWG defined their "no effects (L1)"
> data as anything less than 90% control performance, and their "minor
> (L2)" effects as anything within 80% of control performance AND
> significantly different from controls. I interpret L2 as representing
> toxicity test results as being effects significantly less than controls
> and between 80-90% of control performance. IF this is a correct
> interpretation, here are the total numbers of samples in this "bin" from
> the round 2 report (Table 3-30 of Appendix G):
>
> Chironomus growth = 24 (10% of 223 total)
> Hyalella growth = 98 (42% of 233 total)
>
> Here is the whole table (if it comes through in the e-mail)
>
>
>
> If I am interpreting this correctly, this would mean that 10 - 42% of
> the test results from Round 2 that our scheme would call a "minor
> effect" would become a "no effect" in LWG's proposed scheme. Please have
> a look and let me know if I'm missing something.
> -Bob
>
>
> --
> Jay Field
> Assessment and Restoration Division
> Office of Response and Restoration, NOAA
> 7600 Sand Point Way NE

> Seattle, WA 98115-6349
> (P) 206-526-6404
> (F) 206-526-6865
> (E) jay.field@noaa.gov
>

--
Jay Field
Assessment and Restoration Division
Office of Response and Restoration, NOAA
7600 Sand Point Way NE
Seattle, WA 98115-6349
(P) 206-526-6404
(F) 206-526-6865
(E) jay.field@noaa.gov